

The County and State Taxing of the Koháry Demesnes in Hont County in the 1710's and 1720's

ZOLTÁN IGOR KOMJÁTI

Private researcher, Abasár, Hungary

Abstract: The campaigns against the Ottoman Empire and the War of Independence named after Francis Rákóczi lasting almost 30 years thoroughly ruined the economy of the Hungarian Kingdom by the beginning of the 1710's. The Sovereign (Charles the Third) and the governmental organizations tried to issue decrees for the constant development, but they almost all the time left out of consideration the difficult cost-of-living condition of the county inhabitants. The taxes imposed after "porta number" on the counties (gratuitous labour, winter quarters, billeting and conveyance for the transient army and doing wagon-traffic in the time of the Campaign of Bácska) were exactly supposed to fulfill by the county, so the Magistrate distributed to each settlements. The Koháry Family had two demesnes in the territory of Hont County: Čabrad' and Sitno, and the state and the county taxation applied to them in the same way as the other settlements. But Stephen (István) Koháry (directing Hont County as Lord-Lieutenant since 1711) always got an opportunity for acquiring the exemption of the demesnes from the gratuitous labour. Primarily, he had applied to Sovereign Charles the Third for issuing a diploma of exemption, then he introduced it with both the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council and Hont County Magistrate. Thus, the two demesnes of Koháry were always exempted from the gratuitous labour, imposed and varied several times annually, and fulfilled either at Buda or Esztergom Fortresses. Last but not least, it can be observed that tendency that the existence of a diploma of exemption might not guarantee the automatic acceptance, in fact, it would be yearly applied for it, would be make it accepted on each occasion, and the acceptance of the exemption was the permanent item on the agenda of a county delegate negotiating with the higher authorities. The paper offers a deeper view into the the practice of the county taxation, and it sized up the economic life of Hont County in the first third of the 18th century.

Keywords: payment of taxes, Hont County, Hungarian Kingdom, economic history, 18th century.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24040/ahn.2020.23.02.29-53>

The Habsburg Government had a big challenge to face in 1711: it had to develop the Hungarian Kingdom economically to the level of the Hereditary Lands. This was not proved simple task, as the 16-years-long course of the Ottoman Empire's dislodgement and the shortly after following War of Independence, with Francis Rákóczi as the leader of the insurgent army, almost entirely exhausted the economic resources

of the population.¹ There was a need for consequent, wise and purposeful taxation and economic policy for Hungary's rehabilitation again.² But it was also essential that the Sovereign had to maintain a regular army in an efficient state to defend from external adversaries. The Government entailed the costs of the Regiments' marching, catering and winter quarters, moreover the costs of the construction works of the Fortresses on the Counties.³ Then the Counties distributed them among their districts and settlements.

In this text the light is thrown on the Magistrate's methods of imposing and exaction of the taxes, being necessary for running the Government and Hont County during the time of Stephen Koháry (1649–1731) as Lord-Lieutenant (*supremus comes*). At the same time, we can have a deeper view into the process of the procuring of tax exemption and the difficulties of the application and the enforcement, instancing the Kohárys' demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno.

Joseph the First conferred the Lord-Lieutenant Office of Hont County on Stephen Koháry in the very beginning of 1711, but it lasted almost one year till his entry. The County suffered on account of the War of Independence, named after Rákóczi, as (the similarly Lord-Lieutenant) Wolfgang Koháry left this area, and soon such Magistrate assumed the authority which was allegiant to Rákóczi. Then the County turned into General Hannibal Heister's *comandancia* in 1709. So Hont County was highly expectant of Stephen Koháry's entry so the reconsolidation will have started off during his activity on all walks of life.

(I would like to thank to Hajnalka Tóth, Ph.D., for the helping with the translations of the gothic type lettered archival resources.)

EXPENSES CONCERNING THE MILITARY PROVISIONS

Hont County compiled those schedules of assessment lists which contained the sum of the Imperial soldiers' (*oralis et equilis*) portions being in winter quarters between 1st of November, 1708 and 30th of April, 1709, the common essential expenses of the County and the salary of the County Heyducks (*summoners*); but they did not contain the second correction of the tax-offer. On the strength of the lists, it was emerged that bigger taxes were imposed on several settlements, more than which was their duties. Mainly the settlements belonging to the District of Banská Štiavnica were concerned with this overtaxation, amid the Demesne of Sitno of the Koháry Family.⁴

¹ MAGYARORSZÁG története 4/1., 1989, pp. 290–291.

² In the same place, pp. 507.

³ In the same place, pp. 596–597.

⁴ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691–1754), schedules of assessment lists of Hont County (April of 1709).

Settlements of the Demesne of Sitno	Tax imposition (in Rhenish forint and denarius)	Overpaid tax and repayable money (in Rhenish forint and denarius)
Svätý Anton (Szentantal)	254 forints 25 denarii	none
Žibritov (Zsibritó)	339 forints	448 forints 50 denarii
Ilija (Illés)	111 forints 87 ½ denarii	365 forints
Sitnianska (Szitnyató or Steffoltó)	65 forints 56 denarii	158 forints
Krnišov (Kormosó)	339 forints	345 forints 50 denarii
Beluj (Béld or Belluja)	508 forints 50 denarii	846 forints 50 denarii
Prenčov (Berecsfalva)	466 forints	799 forints 87 ½ denarii
Sitnianska Lehôtka (Szitnyaliget or Lehotka)	84 forints 75 denarii	128 forints 25 denarii
Devičie (Devicse)	203 forints 87 ½ denarii	332 forints 12 ½ denarii
Altogether	2372 forints 81 denarii	3423 forints 85 denarii

The villages of the Demesne of Čabrad'⁵ belonged to the Districts of Bzovík and Banská Štiavnica were obliged to pay the following tax sums.

Settlements of the Demesne of Čabrad'	District	Tax imposition (in Rhenish forint and denarius)	Overpaid tax and repayable money (in Rhenish forint and denarius)
Ipolyvece (Hungary, Nógrád County)	Bzovík	169 forints 50 denarii	none
Dolná Vinica (Ipolyalsónyék)	Bzovík	254 forints 25 denarii	none
Horná Vinica (Ipolyfelsónyék)	Bzovík	169 forints 50 denarii	none
Čelovce (Csall)	Bzovík	339 forints	none
Opava (Apafalva or Apova)	Bzovík	254 forints 25 denarii	none
Ipeľské Úľany (Ipolyfödemes)	Bzovík	127 forints 12 ½ denarii	none
Čabradský Vrbovok (Csábrágvarbók)	Bzovík	254 forints 25 denarii	none
Plášťovce (Palást)	Banská Štiavnica	678 forints	none
Slatina (Szalatnya)	Banská Štiavnica	254 forints 25 denarii	none
Dolné Semerovce (Alsószemeréd)	Banská Štiavnica	111 forints 87 denarii	none
Vyškovce nad Ipl'om (Ipolyvisk)	Banská Štiavnica	296 forints 62 ½ denarii	none

⁵ To the identifying of the settlements of the Demesne of Čabrad': SZIRÁCSIK, 2017, p. 30.

Preseľany nad Ipľom (Pereszlény)	Banská Štiavnica	254 forints 25 denarii	none
Medovarce (Méznevelő)	Banská Štiavnica	339 forints	none
Altogether		3501 forints 87 denarii	

At bidding of Hont County, a committee was established in January, 1720 for determining the military tax rates imposed on each county settlements: on the one hand, concerning the expenses of the supplying and conveyance of the transient military (*imputatio transennalis expensarum et vecturarum*) from 1st of January till 31st of December, 1718; and on the other hand, concerning the alimentation expenses of the military staying in winter quarters (*intertentionis quartery*) in the period lasting from 1st of November, 1718. till 31st of May, 1719. The expenses imposed on the Koháry-demesnes is the following⁶:

Settlement	Demesne	Expenses of transient military		Expenses of conveyance		Expenses of winter quarters		Altogether	
		ft	den	ft	den	ft	den	ft	den
Svätý Anton (Szentantal)	Sitno	18	39	81	75	247	–	347	14
Žibritov (Zsibritó)	Sitno	47	4	132	–	563	–	742	7
Ilija (Illés)	Sitno	–	54	83	50	294	–	378	4
Sitnianska (Szitnyató or Steffoltó)	Sitno	it does not figure on the assessment lists							
Krnišov (Kormosó)	Sitno	47	51 ½	178	–	648	75	874	26 ½
Beluj (Béld or Belluja)	Sitno	39	18 ½	242	50	817	75	1099	43 ½
Beluj (Béld or Belluja): due to the conflict with the military		–	–	–	–	6	50	6	50
Prenčov (Berencsfalva)	Sitno	31	54 ½	257	–	659	–	947	54 ½

⁶ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691–1754), minutes of the tax determining committee of Hont County (Krupina, 8–9th of January, 1720).

The County and State Taxing of the Koháry Demesnes in Hont County ...

Sitnianska Lehôtka (Szitnyaliget or Lehotka)	Sitno	1	98	41	50	132	50	175	98
Devičie (Devicse)	Sitno	18	70 ½	147	50	398	17	564	37 ½
Ipolyvece (Hungary, Nógrád County)	Čabrad'	107	60 ½	112	75	362	50	582	85 ½
Dolná Vinica (Ipolyalsónyék)	Čabrad'	54	28 ½	62	25	180	25	296	78 ½
Horná Vinica (Ipolyfelsónyék)	Čabrad'	44	47	51	-	180	25	275	72
Čelovce (Csall)	Čabrad'	18	1 ½	65	-	551	-	634	1 ½
Opava (Apafalva or Apova)	Čabrad'	20	28	77	50	376	-	473	78
Ipeľské Úľany (Ipolyfödémés)	Čabrad'	it does not figure on the assessment lists							
Čabradský Vrbovok (Csábrágvarbók)	Čabrad'	28	74	213	-	411	-	652	74
Plášťovce (Palást)	Čabrad'	50	60	128	75	452	50	631	85
Plášťovce (Palást): due to the conflict with the military		-	-	-	-	3	60	3	60
Slatina (Szalatnya)	Čabrad'	27	84 ½	98	50	220	-	346	34 ½
Slatina (Szalatnya): due to the conflict with the military		-	-	-	-	-	60	-	60
Dolné Seme-rovce (Alsósze-meréd)	Čabrad'	113	65 ½	244	50	387	50	745	65 ½
Vyškovce nad Ipľom (Ipolyvisk)	Čabrad'	144	98	199	50	490	-	804	48
Preseľany nad Ipľom (Pereszlény)	Čabrad'	217	69	170	-	357	50	745	19
Medovarce (Méznevelő)	Čabrad'	26	28	176	-	394	91 ½	597	19 ½
Altogether		1059	34 ½	2762	50	8134	28 ½	11956	13

In spring of 1721, the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council ordered Hont County to provide the Hannover Cuirassier Regiment for the period lasting till 1st of May. The County Magistrate and the commissioned personnel of the regiment agreed that one portion equals with 44 dicas.⁷ Nicholas Dvornikovics, Deputy-Lieutenant (vice-comes), made Stephen Koháry aware of that the agreement had come about on 24th of March, and also sent him the list of the portion numbers belonged to each county settlements.⁸ On the basis of the list, the Koháry demesnes took part in the providing of the Hannover Regiment as follows.⁹

Settlement	De-mesne	Rank and unit of the provided person(s)	Oralis portio	Equilis portio
Svätý Anton (Szentantal)	Sitno	captain, cuirassier squadron	2 ½	1
Žibritov (Zsibritó)	Sitno	corporal, cuirassier squadron cavalrymen, cuirassier squadron	1 ½ 4	1 -
Ilija (Illés)	Sitno	sub-lieutenant, cuirassier squadron	2	2
Sitnianska (Szitnyatór or Steffoltó)	Sitno	sub-lieutenant, cuirassier squadron cavalrymen, cuirassier squadron	- 1	1 -
Krnišov (Kormosó)	Sitno	captain, cuirassier squadron	4 ½	3
Beluj (Béld or Belluja)	Sitno	corporal, cuirassier squadron	1 ½	1
Prenčov (Berencfalva)	Sitno	quartermaster, cuirassier squadron cavalrymen, cuirassier squadron	2 6	2 -
Sitnianska Lehôtka (Szitnyaliget or Lehotka)	Sitno	captain, cuirassier squadron	-	2
Devičie (Devicse)	Sitno	squadron clerk, cuirassier squadron cavalrymen, cuirassier squadron	1 3	2 -
Ipolyvece (Hungary, Nógrád County)	Čabrad'	captain, regimental commander's squadron cavalrymen, regimental commander's squadron	- 1	3 -

⁷ The meaning of „dica”, see: POÓR, 2009, p. 40.

⁸ MNL-OL C 756th roll № 374., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars IV.), Nicholas Dvornikovics's letter to Stephen Koháry (Lontov, 2nd of April, 1721).

⁹ In the same place, enclosure of № 374, list of the settlements of Hont County ordered to supply the Cuirassier Regiment of Hannover (24th of March, 1721).

The County and State Taxing of the Koháry Demesnes in Hont County ...

Dolná Vinica (Ipolyalsónyék)	Čabrad'	cavalrymen, regimental commander's squadron	2	-
Horná Vinica (Ipolyfelsónyék)	Čabrad'	cavalrymen, regimental commander's squadron	2	-
Čelovce (Csall)	Čabrad'	lieutenant, regimental commander's squadron	2	-
Opava (Apafalva or Apova)	Čabrad'	captain, regimental commander's squadron cavalrymen, regimental commander's squadron	- 2	3 -
Ipeľské Úľany (Ipolyfödémés)	Čabrad'	cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	2	-
Čabradský Vrbovok (Csábrágvarbók)	Čabrad'	drum-major, staff squadron regimental doctor, staff squadron	- 2	1 2
Plášťovce (Palást)	Čabrad'	squadron clerk, Lutzenthal Squadron cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	- 5	½ -
Slatina (Szalatnya)	Čabrad'	lieutenant, Lutzenthal Squadron cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	1 1	1 -
Dolné Semerovce (Alsószermeréd)	Čabrad'	lieutenant, Lutzenthal Squadron cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	2 1	2 -
Vyškovce nad Ipľom (Ipolyvisk)	Čabrad'	cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	5	-
Preseľany nad Ipľom (Pereszleány)	Čabrad'	captain, Lutzenthal Squadron cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	3 1	1 -
Medovarce (Méznevelő)	Čabrad'	cavalrymen, Lutzenthal Squadron	5	-
Altogether			66	28 ½
Portio number imposed on the whole County			409 ½	67

If we can examine the quantity of the portio number imposed on the Koháry-settlements for the providing of each units, we can ascertain the following contexts.

Name of the Squadron	Total of oralis portio for the Squadron	Total of equilis portio for the Squadron	Oralis portio imposed on the Koháry-settlements	Equilis portio imposed on the Koháry-settlements
Staff Squadron	34	40	2	3

Regimental Commander's Squadron	37	21	9	6
Cuirassier Squadron	126	32	29	15
Lutzenthal Squadron	121	47	26	4 ½

Due to the several enormous burdens, the bondage fulfilled the taxation hard, so its debts were often more and more aggregated. The county audit office (*censuralis deputatio*) which was established in the summer of 1713 and being at work till the following General Assembly, took cognizance of the fact that several villages had partly paid their taxes for the supplying of the Somodi Regiment on the basis of Amery Petróczy's tax roll. Krnišov was in debt with 3 forints and 50 denarii, Ilija with 39 forints and 50 denarii, Sitnianska Lehôtka with 2 forints and 19 denarii, Plášťovce with 43 forints and 19 denarii, Sitnianska Lehôtka with 10 forints and Svätý Anton with 48 forints. The inhabitants swore to the truth of paying their all debts: partly to the Somodi-soldiers, partly to the since that defuncted John Trajtler, tax-collector. But as the villagers could not adduce proof of the quantity of the paid sum, so that will be considered as overpaid money in case of an accidental, further taxation.¹⁰

The tax-collectors saw the inhabitants of Čabradský Vrbovok one after another about their default of two kinds of debts in summer of 1714. Firstly, the villagers complained to Paul Návay, because their toll had not been paid so far according to the toll-collector's roll, and he encashed 3 forints from one of them. In the opinion of Paul Návay, the inhabitants of Čabradský Vrbovok only then exclaim against the tolling, if the fact of the agreement between the county and them, or any exemption is marked in the terrier (*urbarium*). As none of such mark can be found in it concerning the village, thus it is clearly seen, that their toll will have been paid, only if Stephen Koháry has some official document of exemption or some documents by means of it, would change the county agreement.¹¹ Nearly in that time, some villagers of Čabradský Vrbovok went to Stephen Koháry and complained to him that they were blamed for being behindhand with the paying the expenses of the military billeting, and the county immediately demanded that sum, which was injustice by the villagers' opinion. Stephen Koháry

¹⁰ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691–1754), minutes of Hont County Audit Office (Krupina, 8th of June, 1713).

¹¹ MNL-OL C 754th roll № 216., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars IV.), Paul Návay's letter to Stephen Koháry (Bzovík, 27th of June, 1714).

immediately wrote a letter to Leslie Dobay county tax-collector (perceptor), asking for information whether the dwellers of Čabradský Vrbovok are really debtors of the county? The tax-collector reported upon the fact: in the time of the latest military billeting, the county had allocated Krnišov and Devičie as such „substitute places”, where the soldiers beyond the fore-announced quantity will be lodged. The county could not direct any soldiers to that settlements. But the Hungarian officer commanding that unit of the Esterházy Regiment billeted to Krupina (Korpona), wanted to get lodge for his German comrades, and all the time he bothered Dobay for an allocation of a free village (assignatio). As Dobay was not authorized to arranging, so he suggested him to apply to the Deputy-Lieutenant and the District Guiders (iudex nobilium or iudlium), and most likely they would sent the German military to Čabradský Vrbovok. And as regard the debt, the villagers really obliged to pay to the County, what Dobay itemized to Koháry. The tax proportion of Čabradský Vrbovok imposed by the County (obtingens) was 460 Rhenish forints and 12 and ½ denarii, from which 306 Rhenish forints had been paid in cash by the villagers. Then the settlement had also handed over 76 Rhenish forint and 44 denarii to Samuel Blaskovics district guider (iudex nobilium) for its proportion of the catering of the military of the Regiment Viard and Regiment Esterházy being in winter quarters, and supplying of the transient military marching through the County in the period lasted from 1st of November, 1713. till 30th of April, 1714. Thus, the inhabitants of Čabradský Vrbovok really were in the County's debt with 77 forints and 68 denarii.¹²

DEBTS CONCERNING THE CHAMBER OF BANSKÁ ŠTIAVNICA

At the request of the Chamber of Banská Štiavnica, Hont County directed settlements several times to take part in the mining work since the autumn of 1708. The economic and regional consolidation after the Liberation War named after Ferenc Rákóczi materialized only slowly. For example, this can be seen from the fact, that though the County counted up the repayable money for the overfulfilled mining works and promised the concerned villages to give back that sum in any case. But that sum was inconsecutively re-distributed among the settlements by them, moreover, the County strictly exacted all kind of other taxes from the settlements, albeit they had dire needs for that sum to arrange the former demands. That problem especially bore upon the Koháry demesnes in 1713: as they were situated geographically nearer to the adits and shafts of Banská Štiavnica (Selmecbánya or Schemnitz), so the

¹² In the same place, № 217., Leslie Dobay's letter to Stephen Koháry (Krupina, 29th of June, 1714).

County most of all primarily directed that villages to carry out the mining works between 1708 and 1712. The villages took out loans to pay for the military and county taxes (*impositio*), and due to the paying off with the interests, they almost totally ran into debt. By the decision of the County (punctually after, when the villages of the two Koháry demesnes met their debts with the interests) certain Hontian settlements got the repayable money for the overfulfilled mining works, more than 55 thousand forints. But it was financed by the County from the formerly collected taxes, amid the money which was discussed from the settlements of the two demesnes. And what is more, on the basis of the tax roll of the County tax-collector, the villages of the Koháry demesnes were still in debt with the payment of the „*impositio*”, so they were menaced by him with money execution. Stephen Koháry wrote a letter to the County Magistrate, drew its attention to the aforesaid facts, and asked the Magistrate not to collect any taxes from the settlements of his demesnes (mainly the „*portio*” for the winter quarter) as long as they would not get back the money originated from the overfulfilled mining works.¹³

The unsystematical overtaxing also continued in 1714, and therefore a deputation of the inhabitants of Žibritov and Devičie applied to Koháry as their landlord for help in August. The two villages were exacted to pay for the behindhand mining works several times previously, so they were compelled to take out a loan of 200 forints from John Trajtler for covering their debts to the County. But later the County also exacted this sum for the two villages again, because the since that defuncted John Trajtler marked that sum as a debt in his account. Thus, it was distressing for the villages that they previously was debt in several hundreds of forints, which now was more increased. Stephen Koháry asked Stephen Kelkó, Deputy-Lieutenant, to draw the County Magistrate on annulling that debt of 200 forints, and „...*You do not let the villagers fall on evil days with overtaxations over and over again...*”.¹⁴

After all, at the summer of 1715, Hont County systemized the total cost of the mining-works fulfilled between 1708 and 1712, and made a decision about re-paying the money being equivalent to the price of the over-fulfilled works for all of the settlements. Certain settlements belonging to the Districts of Banská Štiavnica and Bzovík sent draught-horses to the mines, and gave diggers and labourers for actuating the

¹³ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 3. škatuľa (Torzo spisov z rokov 1708–1756), Stephen Koháry's letter to Hont County (Čabrad', 24th of October, 1713).

¹⁴ MNL-OL C 1123rd roll N^o 7087., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Stephen Koháry's letter to Stephen Kelkó, Deputy-Lieutenant of Hont County (Čabrad', 23rd of August, 1714). The original Hungarian text is the following: „...*ne engedje a supererogatumokon felül ezen supererogatumoknak [a 200 forintnak] is exactiójával őket pusztulásra jutni...*”.

mine equipments in the period lasting from 1st of November, 1708 to 31st of October, 1710.¹⁵ The Chamber of Banská Štiavnica did not give them back any money at all, but they were compensated with counting in the half price of their journey-work. That means the following items concerning the Koháry demesnes:

The settlements of the Demesne of Sitno	The sum to be repaid between 1708 and 1710
Svätý Anton (Szentantal)	382 forints and 50 denarii
Žibritov (Zsibritó)	501 forints and 83 denarii
Ilija (Illés)	216 forints and 12 denarii
Sitnianska (Szitnyató or Steffoltó)	67 forints and 50 denarii
Krnišov (Kormosó)	499 forints and 77 denarii
Beluj (Béld or Belluja)	675 forints and 80 denarii
Prenčov (Berencsfalva)	619 forints and 50 ½ denarii
Sitnianska Lehôtka (Szitnyaliget or Lehotka)	67 forints and 50 denarii
Devičie (Devicse)	none
Altogether	3030 forints and 52 ½ denarii

Then the Chamber of Banská Štiavnica deducted the quantity of the „portio” taxation form for the period lasted from 29th of November, 1710 to 25th of April, 1711, and gave Jacob Othi, Military Commissioner of Hont County, back a sum of 2158 Rhenish forints and 35 ½ denarii. That sum was forwarded by him to the county tax-collector (perceptor) who counted in the tax sum of the settlements. That concerned the Koháry demesnes so:

Name of the settlement	Demesne	The sum to be repaid for the year of 1710/1711
Ipolyvece (Hungary, Nógrád County)	Čabrad'	none
Dolná Vinica (Ipolyalsónyék)	Čabrad'	none
Horná Vinica (Ipolyfelsónyék)	Čabrad'	none
Čelovce (Csall)	Čabrad'	26 forints and 32 ½ denarii
Opava (Apafalva or Apova)	Čabrad'	14 forints and 83 denarii
Ipeľské Úľany (Ipolyfödemes)	Čabrad'	none
Čabradský Vrbovok (Csábrágvarbók)	Čabrad'	none
Plášťovce (Palást)	Čabrad'	none

¹⁵ MNL-OL C 1191st roll, second enclosure of № 8369, (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), account of the fulfilling works of the settlements of Hont County between 1708 and 1710.

Slatina (Szalattya)	Čabrad'	none
Dolné Semerovce (Alsószemeréd)	Čabrad'	none
Vyškovce nad Ipľom (Ipolyvisk)	Čabrad'	none
Preseľany nad Ipľom (Pereszlény)	Čabrad'	none
Medovarce (Méznevelő)	Čabrad'	none
Svätý Anton (Szentantal)	Sitno	41 forints and 72 denarii
Žibritov (Zsibritó)	Sitno	50 forints
Ilija (Illés)	Sitno	32 forints and 10 denarii
Sitnianska (Szitnyató or Steffoltó)	Sitno	none
Krnišov (Kormosó)	Sitno	54 forints and 85 denarii
Beluj (Béld or Belluja)	Sitno	105 forints and 40 denarii
Prenčov (Berencsfalva)	Sitno	98 forints and 95 denarii
Sitnianska Lehôtka (Szitnyaliget or Lehotka)	Sitno	13 forints and 60 denarii
Devičie (Devicse)	Sitno	22 forints and 15 denarii
Altogether		459 forints and 92 ½ denarii

The statute-labour of the Hont County settlements toward the Chamber of Banská Štiavnica was fulfilled till 12th of November, 1712. By the order of the King, Zollenstein Supreme Military Commissioner made those debts give back, which were equalized to the overfulfilled mining-works. It amounted to 12,473 Rhenish forints and 11 denarii, which from the Chamber handle 5370 forints and 80 ½ denarii over to the county tax-collector, but discharged an account of 7102 forints and 11 denarii. (From this sum was deducted 2978 forints and 6 ½ denarii for those „repartitio” obligation, which was fulfilled by the help of draught-horses coming from the settlements and manpower for digging of fishponds.) From the afore-mentioned 5370 forints and 80 ½ denarii, the following money were concerned with the Koháry demesnes¹⁶:

Name of the settlement	Demesne	The sum to be repaid for the year of 1712/1713
Ipolyvece (Hungary, Nógrád County)	Čabrad'	none
Dolná Vinica (Ipolyalsónyék)	Čabrad'	none
Horná Vinica (Ipolyfelsónyék)	Čabrad'	none
Čelovce (Csall)	Čabrad'	36 forints and 81 denarii
Opava (Apafalva or Apova)	Čabrad'	23 forints and 48 denarii
Ipeľské Úľany (Ipolyödémés)	Čabrad'	none
Čabradský Vrbovok (Csábrágvarbók)	Čabrad'	74 forints and 37 denarii
Plášťovce (Palást)	Čabrad'	none

¹⁶ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 3. škatuľa (Torzo spisov z rokov 1708–1756), tax account of the settlements of Hont County labouring for the Chamber of Banská Štiavnica for debt reductions (Krupina, 29th of June, 1715).

The County and State Taxing of the Koháry Demesnes in Hont County ...

Slatina (Szalatnya)	Čabrad'	none
Dolné Semerovce (Alsószemeréd)	Čabrad'	none
Vyškovce nad Ipľom (Ipolyvisk)	Čabrad'	none
Preseľany nad Ipľom (Pereszlény)	Čabrad'	none
Medovarce (Méznevelő)	Čabrad'	17 forints and 25 denarii
Svätý Anton (Szentantal)	Sitno	94 forints and 1 ½ denarii
Žibritov (Zsibritó)	Sitno	140 forints and 1 ½ denarii
Ilija (Illés)	Sitno	85 forints and 52 ½ denarii
Sitnianska (Szitnyató or Steffoltó)	Sitno	none
Krnišov (Kormosó)	Sitno	143 forints and 37 ½ denarii
Beluj (Béld or Belluja)	Sitno	290 forints and 91 denarii
Prenčov (Berencsfalva)	Sitno	262 forints and 79 denarii
Sitnianska Lehôtka (Szitnyaliget or Lehotka)	Sitno	37 forints and 83 ½ denarii
Devičie (Devicse)	Sitno	none
Altogether		1206 forints and 37 ½ denarii

But there were problems concerning the overpaying after the 1715 summer account. The inhabitants of Devičie were omitted from the list of the settlements which sent draught-horses to the mining works, so they suffered a loss of 165 forints. Francis Bánhidý, Land-Stewart, had to detect the reason of it. It was cleared that Devičie gave draught-horses to the mining-works in only one occasion, but then so, that the village coacted with Žibritov and Krnišov, and the three settlements collectively sent the draught-horses to Banská Štiavnica. The village mayors of the other two settlements and the Captain of the County Villagers (in Hungarian: parasztvármegye kapitánya) confessed un-animously that the horses of Devičie really sent to the mining town together with the ones of Žibritov and Krnišov, and they affirmed that fact in writing. That could be found in the records of the former tax-collector, John Laszkáry. Thus, the 165 forints was due to Devičie, but that sum ought to be paid by the other two villages, because they had got it from the County.¹⁷

Occasionally, the Koháry-demesnes were obliged to do wagon-traffic for military purposes. When the Campaign of Báčka was launched in 1716, by the order of the Sovereign, all of Hungarian Counties were obliged to send carts to the frontline for supplying the army. Hont County made decision that 180 carts fell upon Major-Hont from the obligatory 225, and after deducting the Mining Town areas, remained 176 carts (after converting the „dica” number of 31784 and $\frac{3}{4}$). But the total „dica” number of the Koháry demesnes (5850) was includ-

¹⁷ MNL-OL C 1298th roll N^o 16219., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Francis Bánhidý's letter to Stephen Koháry (Čabrad', 24th of December, 1715).

ed into that number, that equalled 27 and ½ carts. (There is no archival resource about taking into consideration any exemption.)¹⁸

THE ACQUIRING OF THE EXEMPTION OF THE KOHÁRY DEMESNES FROM THE FULFILLING OF THE GRATUITOUS LABOUR

There were customary orderliness in Hungary from the middle of the 16th century (from the forming of the Turkish Occupied Territories) that parliamentary laws ordered the counties to accomplish the free repair and building works of the border castles (*gratuitus labor*). The Magistrates — taking the total number of „portas” (the economical and producing plots of the County) as a basis — determined how many workers and carts would set going to the fulfilling. Although the Court War Council made several border castles demolished at the very beginning of the 18th century, certain important fortresses (mainly along the riverside of the Danube) kept and continued to repair and maintain.¹⁹ Hont County was obliged to fulfill the gratuitous labour at two such strategically important fortresses: Buda and Esztergom.

During the *Hungaria Eliberata* (expulsion of the Ottoman forces from Hungary between 1683 and 1699), Stephen Koháry had continually tried to acquire exemptions from taxation for whichever demesnes, wherever was located²⁰, and did the same from the 1710's, when he endeavoured to procure the exemption from the gratuitous labour for the two demesnes situated in Hont County. As any kind of exemption could be granted by the Sovereign, so Stephen Koháry appealed to Charles the Third (1711–1740) with his request. He wrote to Him that he knew very clearly that royal decree was issued to Hont County about the fulfilling of the gratuitous labour at Buda Fortress, but he would like to acquire exemption from the gratuitous labour for his own Čabrad' Castle and the demesne belonging to it. He reasoned his request so: in the ancestral family castle a garrison being loyal to Koháry served at the beginning of the Independence War named after Rákóczi, who corroborated their oath of allegiance to the Sovereign, and (in spite of every threatening) heroically defended the border castle during the Kurucian blockade, moreover, they made sallies against the besiegers again and again. But after a certain time, they were compelled to hand Čabrad' over to the Kurucs, because the troops being loyal to Francis Rákóczi durative occupied Lower Hungary to Nitra (Nyitra), amid the Mining Towns, and the border castles supposed to defend them (Levice

¹⁸ MNL-OL C 1123rd roll № 7072., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), John Kovács's letter to Stephen Koháry (Nenince, 28th of August, 1716).

¹⁹ OROSS, 2006, pp. 1441–1473.

²⁰ KOMJÁTI, 2018, pp. 74–82.

[Léva], Bzovík [Bozók], Halič [Gács] and Modrý Kameň [Kékkő]), and were not able to replenish the food and ammunition supplies. The Kurucs, making use of the manpower of the brick-layers carried from Banská Bystrica (Besztercebánya) and Banská Štiavnica (Selmecebánya) and the bondsmen living in the neighbourhood, immediately demolished the bastions and the walls, moreover, the 15 cannons, the 2 mortars and all kind of guns and ammunitions were taken away or destroyed. The rebel occupation army totally devastated and pillaged Čabrad' and its surroundings, the civil inhabitants were compelled to escape before them, they made the spot uninhabitable, so the demesne became unfit for the agricultural life, such as the other Hont County demesne centre of the Koháry's, castle Sitno (Szitnya). As an entire reconstruction and rebuilding would need throughout the whole demesne, Koháry asked the Sovereign that the settlements belonging to Čabrad' would be exempted from the gratuitous labour and a diploma (*littera exemptionalis*) would be issued about it, and at last, the Sovereign would inform the Hungarian Royal Court Chancellory and the Court War Council. Koháry also drew the Sovereign's attention to the fact that the Demesne of Čabrad' formerly had the exemption from the gratuitous labor on the basis of the 7th law article of 1681.²¹ Stephen Koháry also wrote another application, in which he advanced before the Sovereign in the same way the devastation of Čabrad' during the rebellion period, but he not only requested the settlements' exemption from the gratuitous labour imposed on Hont County, but also the rebuilding of the castle by the manpower of the bondsmen. He also alluded to the 7th law article of 1681, and he asked for the issuing of the diploma of exemption again, and the Sovereign's notice about it toward the before-mentioned two organizations.²²

By the royal diploma of exemption, Hont County accepted the Koháry demesnes' exemption from the gratuitous labour, but with a condition that the exemption would be claimed on each occasion when the County distributed the ratio of the fulfilling among the county settlements, so as not to be redundantly encumbered. Stephen Koháry as Lord-Lieutenant of Hont County ordered Lucas Pécsy, the Second-Deputy-Lieutenant (*substitutus vice-comes*), that he would announce the claim to the exemption of the Demesne of Čabrad' from the gratuitous labour before the General Assembly held at Šahy (Ipolyság) on 7th

²¹ MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5914., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Stephen Koháry's application for exemption to Sovereign Charles the Third (undated, but on the strength of its content written between 1711 and 1715).

²² In the same place, № 5919, Stephen Koháry's application for exemption to Sovereign Charles the Third (undated, but on the strength of its content written between 1711 and 1715).

of May. Lucas Pécsy did it, and reported to the Lord-Lieutenant that the County accepted the exemption in principle, and wrote a letter about it.²³ Francis Bánhidý, Land-Stewart, also wrote to Koháry about that General Assembly of Šahy, and it is cleared from the letter that the document of the County suggested the proposal of the exemption before the Diet, and if it would be assented and carried there, the County would conform to it. But even if the Diet would not make decision about it, the County accepted the exemption, but the deficit derived from the deducted „porta” numbers would be passed to the other county settlements’ debit.²⁴

On 18th of May, General Regall, the Commander of Buda Fortress, admonished the Counties obliged to fulfill the gratuitous labour (Esztergom, Fejér, Hont, Nógrád and Pest–Pilis–Solt²⁵) to send delegations to him for discussing the conditions of fulfilling.²⁶ On 26th of May, Stephen Koháry asked to Regall to take the exemption of the Demesne of Čabrad’ into consideration. On 28th of May, Regall responded to Stephen Koháry that he would aim to conforming himself to the request.²⁷

On 1st of June, the delegates of Hont County appeared in Buda for the discussion about the fulfilling of the gratuitous labour, and also declared the claim to the exemption of the Koháry demesne. Regall wrote to Stephen Koháry on the same day, that he come to an agreement with the delegates: though the demesne would be free from the fulfilling, but the quantity of the „porta” numbers deducted from the County due to the exemption would be passed to other settlements’ debit.²⁸

Leslie Dobay, County Tax-collector (perceptor), also informed Stephen Koháry about this 1st of June agreement. He and Samuel Blaskovits went on errands in Buda, as they were just about to compromise with Vorstern, Supreme Military Commissioner, about the cost of the winter quarters, but when they became aware of appearance of their county compeers in Buda about the arranging the gratuitous labour (and because Regall and Vorstern usually took part together in the agreement

²³ MNL-OL C 1123rd roll № 7086., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Lucas Pécsy’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Krupina, 14th of May, 1715).

²⁴ MNL-OL C 987th roll № 7160., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars IV.), Francis Bánhidý’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Čabrad’, 15th of May, 1715).

²⁵ Here can be found the number of the Counties directed to Buda Fortress in 1715: MNL-OL C 1192nd roll № 8378., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), John Kovács’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Nenince, 29th of March, 1715).

²⁶ MNL-OL C 1123rd roll № 7123., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), General Regall’s letter to Fejér County (Buda, 18th of May, 1715.). The letters written to each Counties might be similar to this one.

²⁷ MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5910., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), General Regall’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Buda, 28th of May, 1715).

²⁸ In the same place, № 5911., General Regall’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Buda, 1st of June, 1715).

concerning the gratuitous labour), so Dobay and Blaskovits joined to the negotiators. Though Regall wanted nothing obligation from Esztergom County, but — by the order of Charles the Third — the other four counties were encumbered with enormous tasks. For example, Hont County was supposed to send 19 carts and 161 labourer man for the renovation works of Buda Fortress. When the delegates mentioned the exemption of the Demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno, then Regall firstly disapproved of it, and he did not accept it as far as a royal diploma would be arrived about it. But when the county negotiators were just about to leave the room, Regall suddenly asked them back, and concerned himself about the number of the „portas” in the two demesnes which would be deducted from the county quantity. Dobay and his compeers were not able to know that, because the census of the County was not there by them, but Regall did not care for the answer at all, and suddenly announced: however many the number of the „portas”, he countenanced the deduction from the repartition quantity imposed on Hont County, but that number would be passed to other county settlements' debit. Dobay also wrote to Koháry that he would reported about Regall's decision before the County Magistrate at the Partial Assembly held on 7th of June.²⁹ On 5th of June, Stephen Kelkó, Deputy-Lieutenant, and Gabriel Bory, County Notary (both delegated to the Diet of Bratislava), issued an official document for Stephen Koháry and his family. They announced in the document that on the basis of the „porta” number correction specified by the Palatine on the Diet session, Hont County had got 179 portas, and 30 portas were concerned about the Koháry demesnes from it; but they would try to concert with the competent persons about the reduction. Hont County would issue a new document about the consequence to the Lord-Lieutenant after the end of the Diet.³⁰ Then Stephen Koháry asked the exemption of the demesnes in writing from Vorstern, Supreme Military Commissioner, who responded that he exempted by courtesy the demesnes from the gratuitous labour of Hont County (sending carts and workers), and pronounced that it was fulfilled for the 1715 year, that is to say, accepted the entire county obligation.³¹

²⁹ MNL-OL C 1191st roll № 8370., first letter (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Leslie Dobay's letter to Stephen Koháry (Krupina, 5th of June, 1715.). The same also can be found here: MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5913., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), extract of László Dobay's letter.

³⁰ In the same place, № 5924., the official document of the delegates of Hont County delegated to the Diet of Bratislava (Bratislava, 5th of June, 1715).

³¹ In the same place, № 5912., Johann Matthias Vorstern's letter to Stephen Koháry (Pest, 15th of June, 1715).

It can be known why, but the County directed six oxes and two carts from the Demesne of Sitno to Buda due to the fulfilling the gratuitous labour. However, it sent them back at the end of the year, moreover, gave a compensation of 73 forints and 85 denarii to Francis Bánhidý, Land-Stewart, by reason of their deficiency from the agricultural works.³²

In the year of 1716, Stephen Koháry also requested the official document from the County about the „porta” number of the Demesne of Čabrad’ for the reason of the constant efficiency of the exemption and its taking into consideration again. So he directed Francis Bánhidý to go to the General Assembly held at Banská Štiavnica. At the request of Bánhidý, being on behalf of the Landlord officially and legally, Hont County (taking the documents of the county archive into consideration and applying to the ordinary method) issued a new document, and according to it, the Demesne of Čabrad’ had 23 and $\frac{1}{4}$ portas after an arithmetical accuracy scaling.³³

In the year of 1723, Stephen Koháry gave an order to Francis Bánhidý, Land-Stewart of the Demesne of Čabrad’ and Sitno, through Michael Balogh, Land-Stewart, that he would not send only one bondsman at all to the gratuitous labour obligation of Buda. And the Landlord gave Michael Balogh the task that he would ask Gabriel Bory, Hont County Notary, that he would look the royal diploma up from the county archive, which contained the exemption of the demesnes from the gratuitous labour.³⁴

In the spring of 1724, Stephen Koháry commissioned his grand-nephew Andrew Koháry to announce the claim to the exemption of the Demesne of Čabrad’ from the gratuitous labour at the nearest General Assembly, and requested an official document, that the County would not really enrol the demesne into the contributory „portas”, as an effectual royal diploma had been issued about the exemption. On 8th of March, Nicholas Dvornikovics, Deputy-Lieutenant (vice-comes), informed Andrew Koháry that Hont County would be ought to come to a decision about the fulfilling of the gratuitous labour, and mainly because of it, a General Assembly would be held on 28th of March at Plášťovce.³⁵ The young Count lost his two small children during one month in various

³² MNL-OL C 1298th roll № 16234., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Francis Bánhidý’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Čabrad’, 15th of December, 1715).

³³ MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5923., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), document of Hont County about the „porta” number of the Koháry demesnes (Banská Štiavnica, 10th of March, 1716).

³⁴ MNL OL C 756th roll № 408., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars IV.), Michael Balogh’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Bátorová, 28th of May, 1723).

³⁵ MNL-OL C 1298th roll № 16191., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Andrew Koháry’s letter to Stephen Koháry (Svätý Anton, 9th of March, 1724).

contagious illnesses (a little boy named Francis passed away on 10th of February out of his three living children³⁶, then a little daughter died of the contagious illness on 10th of March³⁷), so he willingly threw himself into the county politics, as he tried to alleviate his dolour in that way.

On the second day of the General Assembly held at Plášťovce, on 29th of March, the acceptance of the exemption of the Koháry demesnes from the gratuitous labour took place. Right away after the reading of the royal decree about the fulfilling of the gratuitous labour, Koháry's commissioned persons rose to speak: firstly Francis Bánhidý requested the acceptance of the exemption, then Andrew Koháry announced the claim to the same. The County took their request into consideration, as there really were documents and diplomas about the exemptions from Prince Eugene of Savoy, from General Regall, former Commandant of Buda Fortress, and from Vorstern, Supreme Military Commissioner. Thus, the County Magistrate deduced the 23 $\frac{1}{4}$ „porta” numbers of the Demesne of Čabrad' from the obligatory county quantity, and the demesne was pronounced to be tax-free and untouchable. A county decision was also made about soon sending of John Kovács and Wolfgang Gosztonyi to Buda so as to compromise with Commandant concerning the conditions of the fulfilling of the gratuitous labour.³⁸ Andrew Koháry informed Stephen Koháry about that decision, and also about, that the County would not want the deduced „porta” numbers to be passed to other county settlements' debit, and endeavoured to argue the Commandant into totally cancelling them.³⁹

On the next General Assembly held at Bátovce (Bát) on 8th of May, the County factually made decision about County Judiciary Assessor (Tabulæ Regiæ Iudiciariæ Assessor) John Kovács's and District Guider (iudex nobilem) Wolfgang Gosztonyi's sending to Buda so as to compromise with the Commandant, and most of all, they would refer the matters of the exemption of the Demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno and their numerically 23 and $\frac{1}{4}$ deduction of „porta” numbers from the obligatory fulfilling of the county to him.⁴⁰ On the next day morning,

³⁶ MNL-OL C 1064th roll № 5636., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Andrew Koháry's letter to Stephen Koháry (Svätý Anton, 13th of February, 1724).

³⁷ MNL-OL C 1298th roll № 16192., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Andrew Koháry's letter to Stephen Koháry (Svätý Anton, 12th of March, 1724).

³⁸ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691-1754), minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Plášťovce, 28-29th of March, 1724).

³⁹ MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5918., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Andrew Koháry's letter to Stephen Koháry (Svätý Anton, 2nd of April, 1724).

⁴⁰ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691-1754), minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Bátovce, 8th of May, 1724): „...*Ex Quotta huic Comitatus obvenientium ordinatorumque Curruum & Operariorum tantumdem modali-*

John Kovács stayed at Bátovce yet, and informed Koháry about the county delegation and they would try to argue the Commandant of Buda Fortress into accepting the exemption of the demesnes.⁴¹ On that day, the two delegates really travelled to Buda, and the agreement was came about, because Count Heinrich Joseph Daun immediately wrote a letter to Stephen Koháry. He wrote that he accepted the exemption of the Demesne of Čbraď from the fulfilling of the gratuitous labour presented on the negotiation by John Kovács both orally either written form, but only exclusively having regard to Koháry's own person and his ancestors' virtues. But he declared that he would want to lay claim to the other gratuitous labour fulfilling obliged for Hont County, and desired to be brought into effect as soon as possible.⁴²

In accordance with the mandate of the Sovereign and the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council issued on 6th of May, Hont County was to be obliged to fulfilling the gratuitous labour at Esztergom Fortress and being discharged from the one belonged to Buda Fortress. The members of the General Assembly congregated at Hontianske Tesáre (Teszér) made that decision that the Demesnes of Čbraď and Sitno would remain exempted from the newly imposed free-work obligation (so much as former to Buda), and the half cart and the one worker (by the ratio derived from the 23 and ¼ „porta” number) would not be added to the obligatory five carts and ten workers. (The three mining towns also were exempted from the gratuitous labour with the same ratio, so Hont County would like to sent four carts and eight workers to Esztergom Fortress.) The General Assembly made a decision that Wolfgang Gosztonyi would have to travel to Buda, and present the royal order about the re-direction of the gratuitous labour to the Commandant. But another decision was made that a delegation being consisted of John Újvendégi Canon of the Archibishopric of Esztergom, Nicholas Dvornikovics, Deputy-Lieutenant, and Wolfgang Gosztonyi, District Guider, would go to

tate antecedenter observata defalcaturum, quantum Bonis Csábrágiensibus & Szittnensibus ex portis 23 ¼ constantibus de justo competere et obvenire comperietur...”

⁴¹ MNL-OL C 1191st roll № 8356., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), John Kovács's letter to Stephen Koháry (Bátovce, 9th of May, 1724).

⁴² MNL-OL C 988th roll № 7359., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars IV.), Count Heinrich Josef Daun's letter to Stephen Koháry (Buda, 9th of May, 1724.): „...Compa-ruerant coram me exmissi e gremio Incltyti Comitatus Honthensis Perillustres Domini Ioannes Kovacz et Wolfgangus Gosztonyi et petitum Excellentiae Vestrae ratione immunitatis bonorum Ejus in comitatu Hontensi, et eorum portarum defalcationis ex quanto totius communitatis tam Scriptotenus medio literarum, quam praefatus Dominus Kovacz Mihi oratenus declaraverat; cui petito, quemadmodum ob specialem considerationem erga personam Excellentiae Vestrae jam temporibus antecessoris mei condescensum fuerat, Ita et Ego libenter annui; Eandem solummodo perquam officiose rogans, Incltyto sibi concredito Comitatu demandare dignetur, quatenus Reliquam quotam praestandi quantocius suppeditare non moreturi...”

the Commandant of Esztergom Fortress and announce (among others) the claim to the exemption of the two demesnes and their deduction from the obligatory „porta” number by the proper ratio.⁴³

The light is thrown on the fact by the letter of Andrew Koháry written few days later, that on the General Assembly at Hontianske Tesáre, John Kovács reported his hard negotiation with the Commandant of Buda about the exemption of the Koháry demesnes. The Assembly's main point of controversy was that the „porta” numbers of the three mining towns were included to the obligatory county quantity by the order of the the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council, but, nevertheless, the County gave the exemption to them, same as to the Koháry demesnes. But the Magistrate was afraid of the passing the deficient „porta” numbers to the County by the order of the higher authorities, so they asked Stephen Koháry's mediation through his greatnephew.⁴⁴

Stephen Koháry wrote to Maximilian Schuchknecht, the Commandant of Esztergom Fortress, concerning the exemption of the Demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno on 28th of May, and acquainted him, that he had procured royal diploma for the above-mentioned demesnes, and it had already been accepted by the County. In his reply, Schuchknecht advanced that he would not want to cause Koháry damage dispensing with the exemption, and he willingly approved that Hont County would fulfill the obligatory gratuitous labour of Esztergom with reducing of a half from the carts and one person from the workers on the basis of the „porta” number by the proper ratio.⁴⁵

After all, Hont County bought off the gratuitous labour of Esztergom: on the occasion of the county committee of tax determination (censuralis deputatio) celebrating on 31st of July, the County Tax-collector put an imposition of 4 forints on each „dica”, but it was not appertained to the two Koháry demesnes because of the exemption. That entry was

⁴³ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691–1754), minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Hontianske Tesáre, 13th of June, 1724).

⁴⁴ MNL-OL C 1298th roll № 16200., (ŠABB, Koháry-család levéltára, Pars V.), Andrew Koháry's letter to Stephen Koháry (Svätý Anton, 18th of June, 1724).

⁴⁵ MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5916., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Maximilian Schuchknecht's letter to Stephen Koháry levele (Esztergom, 20th of June, 1724.): „...*Excellentiæ Vestræ literas, Viennæ sub 28 præteriti Mensis Maj' exaratas, quibus Excellentia Vestra, intuitu operariorum ex Curruum ex parte Inclyti Comitatus Honthensis ad Fortality' nostri reparationem præstandorum, me de immunitate a Sua Sacratissima Cæsarea Regiaque Majestate, Super Bonis in prælibato Inclytu Comitatu sitis, iam pridem impetrata, certiore reddere dignata est, debito cum respectu percepi. Prout ergo Excellentia Vestræ in hocce clementissime acquisito Indulto nullatenus præjudicare desidero. Ideo etiam libenter admisi, ut Inclyto Comitatus Honthensis portas Bona nimirum Excellentia Vestra concernentes defalcare, sicque a repartito ac injuncto Numero Operarium unum, ac medium currum minus præstare ausit ac possit...*”

not implicated to the county income (introitus), but according to the decision of the committee, soon the County Tax-collector would have to make a separate report for the County Magistrate.⁴⁶ Amery Foglár, Deputy County Notary, reported before the General Assembly held on 7th of August about the decisions of the „censuralis deputatio” of Bátorová (Bátorfalu), amid the exemption from the gratuitous labour of the two Koháry demesnes, which was accepted by the County anew.⁴⁷

In the spring of 1726, the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council wrote two letters to Hont County that would be supposed to send 22 workers and 9 carts for fulfilling the obligatory gratuitous labour at Esztergom Fortress. The General Assembly held at Hontianske Tesáre on 8th of May made a decision that a county delegation would be sent to the Commandant of Esztergom Fortress. One of the negotiation items contained that the delegates tried to persuade him that lesser carts and workers would be directed to the fortress due to the exemption of the Demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno.⁴⁸ According to the instructions of the county delegates, they was to impart to the Commandant on 13th of May, that due to the exemption granted for Stephen Koháry (which was equally concerned with the repair works either at Buda, or at Esztergom), the county „porta” numbers were decreased with 23 and $\frac{1}{4}$, and equalled 3 workers and 1 cart after the converting. So the County would send 19 workers and 8 carts to Esztergom, what the Commandant would be disposed to take into account and accept.⁴⁹ It is lightened from the Commandant's reply that he sceptically heard the statement of the delegation out, because he had no notion about how the obligatory quantity specified by the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council had been decreased by more than its half, and the County wanted further

⁴⁶ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 4. škatuľa (Kongregačné zápisnice z rokov 1691–1754), minutes of the tax-determination committee of Hont County (Bátorová, 31st of July, 1724).

⁴⁷ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 43. škatuľa (Determinačné protokoly z rokov 1724–1731), minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Dolné Plachtince, 7th of August, 1724).

⁴⁸ In the same place, minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Hontianske Tesáre, 8th of May, 1726).

⁴⁹ MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5926. and C 1292nd roll № 15199., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), negotiating instructions for the delegation of Hont County and the reply of the Commandant of Esztergom concerning to that (May, 1726): „...*Siquidem Bona Excellentissimi ac Illustrissimi Domini Comitis Stephani Kohárÿ de Csábrágh, & Szittnya Iudicis Curia Regia titt. & Familia Suæ Csábrághiensia & Szittnensia ab onere gratuitorum laborum per Superiores Instantias exempta sint, ex prævio assignatis 9 curribus unus, 22 autem manualibus tres secundum calculum arithmeticum ad Portas 23 & $\frac{1}{4}$. attactis exemptis Suæ Excellentia Bonis adhærentes instar modalitatis Annis Superioribus in præstatione similium Gratuitorum Laborum tum ad Budense tum hoc Strigoniense fortalitia practicata demendi, Inputandique, & non nisi residui currus octo, & 19 Laboratores per Comitatum administrandi venient...*”

deductions from it, due to the exemption of the Koháry demesnes. The Commandant accepted the of principle facts, but he answered the delegates that he would make inquiries from the higher authorities about whether the Koháry demesnes really enjoyed any exemption from the gratuitous labour? He said the delegates that he would also make inquiries about the obligatory specified quantity, because his knowledge, Hont County was obliged to send 48 workers and 20 carts for the year of 1726, and not 22 workers and 9 carts as the delegates pronounced. While the reply of the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council would not resolve his scruple, the Commander demanded the first, numerically bigger version from the County.⁵⁰

The County Notary reported before the following General Assembly held at Preseľany nad Ipl'om on 20th of May, that the tax reduction concerned with the Koháry demesnes had not been accepted by the Commandant of Esztergom. So the Deputy-Lieutenant overtook that he would personally see Stephen Koháry about the problem, and then by the help of his mighty of magnate, would try to procure a new possibility of negotiation with the Commandant of Esztergom, where the delegates would prove the fact of the exemption by original documents issued by Prince Eugene of Savoy and other higher authorities. As the documents would be ready, the delegation (consists of the County Notary and the Land-Stewart of the Chapter of Esztergom) immediately started off, and its task would be to make constant efforts for getting the acceptance of the reduced tax quota across to the Commandant.⁵¹ And when the Commandant urged the County for the fulfilling with this letter dated from 22nd of June, the Magistrate responded, that only 8 carts and 19 workers would be sent to Esztergom by the 7th of July, because that quantity was the obligatory in its opinion, and it would be just realized, when the proportioned part would be deducted which was derived from the Demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno.⁵²

It seems that Maximilian Schuchknecht, Commandant of Esztergom Fortress, did not accept the fulfilling way of the County, because Stephen Koháry applied to Prince Eugene of Savoy, Chairman of the Court War Council. In his letter of supplicant, he wrote that an exemption had been granted by the Charles the Third for his Demesnes of Čabrad' and Sitno, and General Regall had taken it into account and had accepted Hont County's gratuitous labour fulfilling with the deduction of the „quota”

⁵⁰ In the same places.

⁵¹ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 43. škatul'a (Determinačné protokoly z rokov 1724–1731), minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Preseľany nad Ipl'om, 20th of May, 1726).

⁵² In the same place, minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Dolné Prábelce, 25th of June, 1726).

number of the demesnes. When the County's obligatory gratuitous labour had been re-directed to Esztergom in 1724, then in that year and in 1725, Maximilian Schuchknecht also accepted the exemption. But in the year of 1726, he rejected to take it into account, and demanded the initial quota numbers specified by the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council. So the Lord-Lieutenant asked Prince Eugene of Savoy to give an order to Schuchknecht for conforming with the royal diploma, besides, the Chairman would be kind enough to forward Koháry's application to the Hungarian Royal Court Chancellory and the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council, so as both would be informed about it, examine its content to the bottom, and make arrangements for the exercise of the exemption.⁵³ Reading the reply of the Court War Council, that in course of the reconciliation with the above mentioned two offices, it was lightened that the military organization was not authorized either to specifying the gratuitous labour fulfilling, or to modifying it, because any of them was exclusively depended on the decision of the Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council. Thus, Hont County would not contradict, instead of it, would do as ordered.⁵⁴

After a few time, The Hungarian Royal Locum-tenens Council ascertained that the „porta” number of 23 $\frac{1}{4}$ concerned with the Koháry demesnes would be more reduced by 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ „portas”. Stephen Koháry asked the County Magistrate to issue a legal and certified document (testimonialis) about that fact, which was really prepared for him.⁵⁵

List of References

KOMJÁTI Zoltán Igor: Koháry István birtokvédelmi törekvései a Hungaria liberata idején (1686–1699). In: *Dominium IV. (A földesurak szerepe)*, a 2016. szeptember 29-én, Miskolcon megtartott 8. Országos Uradalomtörténeti Konferencia kötete. ed. É. Szirácsik, Budapest : Unicus Műhely Kiadó, 2018, pp. 74-82.

Magyarország története 4/1. (1686–1790). eds. Gy. Ember – G. Heckenast, Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989.

MNL-OL = Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltára Budapest

OROSS, András: Végvárakból kaszárnyák (A Budai Kamarai Adminisztráció szerepe Magyarország új katonai berendezésében a 17-18. század fordulóján). In: *Századok*. 140. vol., 6. no., 2006, pp. 1441-1473.

POÓR, János: *Megbékélés és újjáépítés: 1711–1790*. Budapest : Kossuth Kiadó, 2009.

⁵³ MNL-OL C 1230th roll № 12347., (ŠABB, Archive of the Koháry Family, Pars V.), Stephen Koháry's application to Prince Eugene of Savoy (September–October, 1726).

⁵⁴ In the same place. — The reply of the Court War Council can also be found here: MNL-OL C 1082nd roll № 5925.

⁵⁵ ŠABB, Hontianska župa, 43. škatul'a (Determinačné protokoly z rokov 1724–1731), minutes of General Assembly of Hont County (Dolné Rykyně, 17th of February, 1727).

SZIRÁCSIK, Éva: *Gazdálkodás a Koháryak Nógrád vármegyei központú birtokain (1647–1731)*. Budapest : Magyar Mezőgazdasági Múzeum, 2017.

ŠABB = Štátny archív v Banskej Bystrici.

Zhrnutie:

Stoličné a štátne zdanenie Koháryovských rodových majetkov v Hontianskej stolici v 2. a 3. decéniu 18. storočia

Štúdia približuje podobu, výšku a spôsob výberu daní pre potreby štátnej administratívy a armády na príklade dvoch rodových majetkov Koháryovcov v bývalej Hontianskej stolici. Autor analyzuje v troch častiach štúdie tri rôzne formy zdanenia: vojenskú daň v podobe tzv. porcií, štátnu daň vyberanú stoličnými úradníkmi a napokon povinnosť dobrovoľnej práce („gratuitus labor“) poddaných na stavbe pohraničných opevnení a hradov. Pri analýze autor vychádza zo súpisov zaplatených daní – prípadne z evidencie daňových nedoplatkov a pôžičiek – hontianskych obcí, ktoré patrili do dvoch panstiev rodu Koháryovcov v Hontianskej stolici (Čabradské, ležiace v Bzovickom slúžnovskom okrese, a Sitnianske, ležiace v Štiavnickom slúžnovskom okrese). Sledovaným obdobím je 2. a 3. decénium 18. storočia, kedy bol hontianskym županom Štefan Koháry (1649 – 1731). V prvej časti autor komparuje daňové odvody rôznych obcí oboch Koháryovských panstiev pre potreby armády v podobe tzv. porcií (delili sa na tzv. ústne a konské – teda na dávky určené na vyživovanie vojakov a ich koní). Zo zistených údajov vyplýva, že daňové zaťaženie bolo značne vysoké, poddaní ho len s veľkými ťažkosťami platili, často len s pomocou zadlžovania sa. V nasledujúcej časti si autor všima problematiku finančnej kompenzácie poddaných zo Sitnianskeho panstva za ich prácu a poskytnutie koní a povozov pre Banskoštiavnickú banskú komoru v rokoch 1708 – 1712. Zo zistení vyplýva, že banská komora poddanské obce vyplatila s oneskorením niekoľkých rokov, a to tým spôsobom, že splatila podlžnosti obcí, ktoré im vznikli pri platení vojenskej dane (porcie). V tretej časti štúdie je analyzovaná povinnosť dobrovoľnej práce poddaných na stavbe pohraničných opevnení. Z hontianskych obcí mali poddaní povinnosť obnovovať opevnenia Budína a Ostrihomu. Gróf Štefan Koháry od cisára Karola VI. získal oslobodenie od tejto povinnosti pre svojich poddaných na Čabradskom panstve. Argumentoval najmä tým, že počas povstania Františka II. Rákociho ostala posádka hradu Čabrad' verná panovníkovi, a keď neskôr musela hrad opustiť, bol zničený Rákociho kurucmi. Hontianska stolica s oslobodením poddaných od tejto povinnosti súhlasila, musela však časť chýbajúcich pracovných síl získať v iných sídlach. Autor venuje pozornosť najmä administratívnym úkonom, ktoré boli spojené so schválením a praktickým aplikovaním tejto výnimky z poddanských povinností na stoličnej a vládnej úrovni (stoličná správa, Dvorská vojenská rada, vojenské veliteľstvá).